

THE PERRYSBURG JOURNAL.

BY S. CLARK.]

"Agriculture, Commerce, Manufactures."

[\$1.50 IN ADVANCE.]

VOL. 2.

PERRYSBURG, WOOD COUNTY, OHIO, SATURDAY, JUNE 24, 1854.

NO. 16.

What Senator Douglas means by people of Territories governing themselves.

Senator Douglas stated in one of his recent midnight speeches to a brass band of serenaders in this city, that he had spoken his share in favor of the Nebraska bill, and that he did not intend to discuss the subject any more. Since then, he has made three public speeches upon the prolific theme, and to all appearances intends to fire his Nebraska gun as fast as he can load, until the wisdom of his winter's work is acknowledged by the country—if he lives so long.

We also may truthfully say we have written our share in opposition to the Nebraska bill; but after the example of the Senator—save that we violate no promise—we shall continue to discuss its abominations until we bring them all to light, and the authors of them to judgment. How long that will be, it is impossible to say, but we expect to get through our work before the Senator gets through with his.

The more we study the Nebraska bill, the more we are shocked by the enormity of its provisions, some of which have thus far entirely escaped public animadversion; and the more clearly do we realize the motives of its projectors in pushing it through with such precipitation, as to prevent its receiving the consideration which such a measure deserved, and which would have certainly led to its defeat.

We desire to call our readers' attention particularly to-day to the clause defining the terms of citizenship and the qualification of voters, where will be found some provisions for which, we undertake to say, no precedent can be found in American legislation, not even in the alien and sedition laws of President Adams.

It is generally supposed that the Clayton amendment, limiting the right of suffrage in the case of aliens to those who had resided in the territory four years, was rejected, and the emigrants from abroad, who will constitute the bulk of the population for the first few years, will at once be clothed with all the privileges of citizenship in the new territory. We quote the 23d clause of the Nebraska bill, (it is the 5th in the Kansas bill,) to show the erroneousness of this impression, and to direct attention to another qualification attached to the rights of suffrage of American emigrants, of which few, we venture to say, of the thousands now making preparations to settle in the new territory have any idea.

Sec. 23. And be it further enacted, That every free white male inhabitant above the age of 21 years, who shall be an actual resident of said territory, and shall possess the qualifications hereinafter prescribed, shall be entitled to vote at the first election, and shall be eligible to any office within the said territory; but the qualifications of voters, and of holding office, at all subsequent elections, shall be such as shall be prescribed by the Legislative Assembly: *Provided*, that the right of suffrage and of holding office, shall be exercised only by citizens of the United States, and those who shall have declared on oath their intention to become such, and shall have taken an oath to support the Constitution of the United States and the provisions of this act: And provided further, That no officer, soldier, seaman or marine, or any other person in the army or navy of the United States, or attached to troops in the service of the United States, shall be allowed to vote or hold office in said territory, by reason of being on service therein.

By this provision every one may vote at the first election, but after the first election, the legislature prescribes the qualifications of voters, with a proviso that prevents them from doing it, and limits them to the qualifications prescribed by Congress.

These qualifications are citizenship, natural or acquired, and an oath to support the Constitution and the Nebraska Bill.

The declaration of intention referred to, is that mentioned in the naturalization acts, and the oath to support the Constitution is

that taken at the end of a five years' residence after a declaration of intention. None but citizens—those who are born in the country, or, by a five years' naturalization, have become citizens—swear to the Constitution. The Judges who will be appointed will unquestionably so hold, and exclude all others from polls.

But the most insulting provision in this section, and the most intolerable provision in the whole bill, is that which makes it and the Constitution of equal sanctity; which compels every man who presents himself at the polls to vote, or as a candidate for office, to support the Nebraska bill; and which requires him to devote himself to the propagation of slavery before he is allowed to exercise the inalienable right of a freeman.

This is the first time an American citizen has ever been required to take an oath to support an act of Congress; it is the first time suffrage and office were ever made dependent upon such an oath; it is the first time the extension of slavery has been raised to the level of a constitutional duty.

The operation of this qualification will be to exclude from the polls and from office in the territories, nearly every man who goes there from the free States. It will disfranchise nearly every member of every emigrant association that has yet been formed, and place the entire political power of the territory in the hands of slaveholders or slavery propagandists; for no others will or can take the oath required by the terms of this act.

It will also exclude from the polls and from office for five years, every foreigner who may reach the territory after the first election day.

As the great bulk of the future settlers of Nebraska will be foreigners and emigrants from the free States, it is obvious that so far from governing themselves, the inhabitants of the territory will have comparatively nothing to do with making or administering the laws which they are required to obey.—Such is the character of the bill which Senator Douglas informed the brass band, whom he addressed the other night at the St. Nicholas, was based upon the right of the people to govern themselves.—[N. Y. Eve. Post.]

THE DIFFERENCE.—Our citizens, guilty of no other offence than the color of their skin, are imprisoned in Southern ports, in violation, we believe, of our rights under the Constitution of the United States. Yet when Massachusetts sought by legal and constitutional means to test their rights under that sacred instrument, when she sent one of her most eminent citizens, Hon. Samuel Hoar, clothed with her official dignity of the agent of a sovereign State, to appeal, in their own courts of justice, before their own judges, all know how she was treated by South Carolina. The halls of justice of that State were closed against us. Our rights under the Constitution, admitted by a South Carolina judge, were refused us, and our agent was driven by mob violence out of the State. In doing this, South Carolina was sustained by nearly every southern press, now so swift to heap their vituperations upon us. But now, when southern gentlemen come to us and claim rights under the same constitution, which grate harshly upon our moral and religious feelings, when, under circumstances the most aggravating, we keep down as a community, the rebellious promptings of our hearts, and execute the odious law, the very pains taken to assure that execution are distorted into a reproach. How much more of this is it to be expected that human nature will be able to endure.—[Boston Atlas.]

A number of southern senators are said to have declared that they would oppose any treaty for the settlement of the fishery question, or for the establishment of reciprocal trade with Canada, unless it shall contain a clause for the surrender of fugitive slaves. Of course the British government will consent to no such treaty stipulations.

The Facts Compactly Stated.

At the recent nominating State Convention in Vermont, the Hon. J. Meacham, whose speech on the repeal of the Missouri Compromise was one of the best made in Congress, transmitted a letter to the Convention in which he recapitulates the facts in the passage of the Nebraska bill in so clear a manner that we cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of laying it before our readers:

WASHINGTON, May 31, 1854.

* * * * I feel anxious that some one of those men, abler than myself to describe the scenes of the Nebraska struggle, should be in your Convention. And yet, I know that it is impossible for even an eyewitness to give an exact impression of the contest. The alternation of hopes and fears of the phalanx that so long resisted the needless, and unauthorized, and infamous violation of plighted faith, can never be given!

The Missouri Compromise is repealed!—Do you ask how it was done? I will tell you.

1. Without the request, and against the wish of every man who petitioned Congress on the subject.

2. By crowding out of place all the most important business of the session, and crowding in a measure to which an overwhelming majority of the people were opposed.

3. By bringing—I do not say bribing—to its support, through Executive influence and patronage, men who acted against their own declared judgments, and the known will of their constituents.

4. By trampling under foot the Rules of the House of Representatives, made in accordance with the Constitution, and thus violently depriving the minority of their legal rights and just privileges.

5. By refusing to allow the people to express their decision on the question, lest—as Senator Pettit of Indiana declared—the people should refuse it now, or for years to come, and perhaps forever.

If the will of the people had been obeyed, the Act could not have passed. If it had taken its legal place in the order of business, it could not have passed. If the Executive power had not, unrighteously, interposed its influence, it could not have passed. If the Rules of the House, and the rights of the minority, had not been crushed, it could not have passed.

The Missouri Compromise, therefore, was repealed, not only without authority and without law, but in known and acknowledged violation of both!

The Missouri Compromise being repealed, the question of Slavery is re-opened in all the Territories of the Union.

The Baltimore platform being violated by all parties except Northern Whigs, it will not be expected that that body of men will any longer be held by the fragments of a broken and abandoned truce.

In this posture of affairs, I trust that the Whigs of Vermont, holding the first State Convention since the passage of the Nebraska bill, will take ground wisely and firmly, that

1. There shall be no more territory acquired by the funds of freemen, unless on the express condition that Slavery shall be forever excluded from it.

2. That on no condition shall another slave State be added to the Union.

3. That Slavery shall be wiped out of every part of the republic, except where shielded by positive municipal law.

I hope the Whigs of Vermont will take that position, not only for themselves, but for their children after them; and when they have taken it, that they will nail their colors to the mast!

Very truly yours. J. MEACHAM.

The Countess, as she is called, and who claims to be a lineal descendant of Americus Vespucius, is yet a resident of Ogdensburg, N. Y., and occasionally appears on the street.

Slavery in California—Prospect of its Establishment.

Two years ago a law was passed by the California Legislature granting one year to the owners of slaves carried into the territory previous to the adoption of the Constitution, to remove them beyond the limits of the State. Last year the provision of this law was extended twelve months longer.—

We learn by the late California papers that a bill has just passed the Assembly, by a vote of 33 to 21, continuing the same law in force until 1855. The provisions of this bill embrace slaves who have been carried to California since the adoption of her Constitution, as well as those who were there previously. The large majority by which it passed, and the opinions advanced during the discussion, indicate a more favorable state of sentiment in regard to the rights of slaveholders in California than we supposed existed.—[The Mississippian.]

The act here rejoiced over establishes Slavery in California as thoroughly as the heart of a slave-breeder could desire. Of course, it is flagrantly unconstitutional; but how will that help its poor victims? Do you suppose that the gigantic swindle, Sham Democracy, which elected a Legislature to do so wicked an act, is not equally potent in the choice of its Judiciary? If you do you are easily duped. It is just as easy to sustain wicked laws as to pass them, when the supposed interests of unprincipled men are to be promoted thereby. Only in anti-slavery, aroused and guided by a Free Press, is there any protection against such crimes as that above recorded. Slavery would in time insinuate itself into Vermont if it were not for concerted, persisted resistance to it.

A San Francisco paper is giving portraits of the men who compose the present Legislature of that State, giving only initials, but painting them so that all who know may recognize them. Here is one of their biographies, condensed:

H— finished his boyhood in perfecting himself in every existing vice at Natchez-under-the-Hill, Miss., whence his father sent him to an inland brother to reform. Here he seduced a cousin of his own age (eighteen,) and she, disgraced and ruined, fled with him to New Orleans, where he lived awhile by gambling, and finally migrated with her to San Francisco. Here he flourished awhile as a blackleg, but finally his luck turned—he was cleaned out—and at last sold out his paramour cousin to a luckier gambler for money. She refused to be transferred, when he beat her brutally over the head, until he left her motionless, insensible, and as he supposed dead on the floor of their lodging; when he ran away to an interior county, and set up for a politician.—He was successful, as his presence in the Legislature attests. Such characters abound in all newly settled regions where time has not been given for educating social order from chaos. Shall we confer on such, the power of imposing Slavery on unborn generations?—[N. Y. Tribune.]

The N. Y. Times has a correspondent at Jackson, Miss., who communicates what follows, touching the fillibuster movements in that quarter:

"They say that Gen. Quitman and staff are now in New Orleans; that they have all the forces enlisted which they deem to be necessary; that two ships with arms and ammunition have been for some time in the Gulf, and that \$700,000 have been obtained, that many merchants and wealthy men in New Orleans, who have hitherto held aloof, now favor the enterprise and will give it their support. It had been decided, says a man who came up from New Orleans this morning, to do nothing until \$1,000,000 had been procured, and that Gen. Quitman and another man had about concluded to mortgage their estates to make up the sum immediately. Soule has exceeded his instructions, no doubt, it is thought, by agreement, in order, in some way, to further the plan."